DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 137 833 CS 203 341

AUTHOR Fagan, Edward R.
TITLE Communication Certification: A Survey.
PUB DATE Jan 77
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on English Education (15th, Knoxville, Tennessee, March 24-26, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication (Thought Transfer); Secondary Education; *Speech Communication; *Speech Education; State Surveys; *Teacher Certification; *Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Qualifications
IDENTIFIERS Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

Two purposes guided this study: to examine high school administrators' uses, if any, of the Pennsylvania communication credential in teacher employment and to examine the attitudes and employment experiences of communication-credentialed teachers in order to discover what differences their new credential made in their teaching assignments. During the summer and fall of 1976, questionnaires mailed to 52 administrators and 31 teachers certified in communication asked respondents to evaluate the Pennsylvania Department of Education's Standards 1 and 2 of the communication credential in comparison with the comprehensive English credential. In response, the eight administrators who had had experience with communication-certified teachers agreed that the teachers were "more able" or "equally able" to perform their teaching duties, as compared to English-certified teachers, while most of the 31 responding teachers felt that they were trained "better than" or "as well as" English teachers. Exceptions to these generalizations were in the fields of historical foundations of language, syntactical skills, and literary works. (Appendixes contain questionnaires and related material.) (JM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED137833

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Communication Certification: A Survey

Edward R. Fagan

The Pennsylvania State Univeristy

January, 1977

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Edward R. Fagan

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

CS 203 341

Table of Contents

		Page
Summary		i
Background		1
Purposes		3
Limitations		3
Procedure		4
Findings		5
Discussion		8
Conclusions		9
Appendix A:	Administrators' Questionnaire	11
Appendix B:	Communication Teachers' Questionnaire	13
Appendix C:	Letter to Placement Directors	15
Appendix D:	Colleges Authorized by PDE to Offer the Communication Credential as of June, 1975	16

Summary

Questionnaires distributed to high school administrators (N=52) and to teachers certified in Communication (N=31) during the summer and fall of 1976 asked respondents to evaluate the Pennsylvania Department of Education's (PDE) Standards I and II of the Communication credential as compared to the Comprehensive English credential. Contents of Standard I which were evaluated included "understanding the communication process, the processes of language learning, the historical development and present characteristics of the English language, the appreciation of representative and appropriate works from a variety of literature" as well as the "ability to listen, observe and speak effectively in formal and informal situations; to read critically and write effectively for varying purposes, and to assist students in intergrating their communication skills and concepts with varieties of experiences." Evaluations were also made of Standard II which reads as follows: "Concentrated study in one or more of the following areas: linguistic science, speech, literature, writing, journalism, theatre, and non-print media."

Usable responses were received from eight administrators and 31 teachers, but two of the Communication-credentialed teachers did not have jobs; therefore, they did not respond to the job-related questions on their questionnaires. Of the 33 colleges and universities authorized to offer the Communication credential, it was estimated (from postmarks) that only ten responded to the survey.

Only eight of the 52 high school administrators had had experience working with Communication-certified teachers. Generally, these eight agreed that Communication teachers were "more able" or "equally able" to perform their teaching duties as compared to teachers certified in Comprehensive English. Exceptions to this generalization were in the historical foundations of language and the syntactical skills where six of the eight administrators felt that Communication teachers were "not so well trained" as English teachers. Three of

the eight administrators reported that they used Standard II in making teaching assignments.

Most of the 31 teachers who completed the questionnaire felt that they were "better trained" or trained "as well as" English teachers in the Standard I area, and they felt that their students accepted them "better than" or "as well as" English teachers. Only nine and eight of the 31 teachers, respectively, felt that they were not so well educated as English teachers in "historical foundations of language" and "appropriate works from a variety of literature." Special "test" questions on contents showed that responses to those questions revealed a weakness in historical foundations and syntax identification but not so pronounced a weakness in literature. Only three of the 31 teachers indicated that Standard II had not been used in their teaching assignments; the rest noted that Standard II had been used "heavily" or "some" in the determination of their teaching assignments.

Results of this survey suggest that within the next two years (1) administrators need to increase their awareness and utilization of Communication credential; (2) a more systematic comparison between English and Communication-certified teachers needs to be made. Sampled teachers' attitudes toward their preparation programs and their on-the-job experiences under one or the other of the credentials should be pivotal to the study; (3) more sophisticated evaluation procedures need to be devised for this proposed study; and (4) funds sufficient to insure a thorough statistical treatment of data collected must be provided if the results of the study are to have any impact on future certification programs in Pennsylvania.

Communication Certification: A Survey

Edward R. Fagan
The Pennsylvania State University

Background

Student agitation in the late sixties and early seventies for "relevant, personal and marketable" contents in high school English programs culminated with a Pennsylvania-Department-of-Education approved teacher certification program labeled "Communication." The Communication credential was recommended as an alternative to the Comprehensive English credential and was deemed necessary to counter what high school administrators regarded as the overemphasis on literature so characteristic of prospective English teachers' certification programs.

The Communication program was carefully planned and incorporated recommendations made by high school teachers and administrators as well as those by college professors from disciplines related to the proposed program, for example, linguistics, speech, non-print media and the like. These recommendations were gathered over a two-year period at a series of regional meetings focused on the alternative credential which were attended by all interested and potentially affected parties. While some participants at all these meetings defended the Comprehensive English program as adequate, most of those in attendance felt that the Communication program should be tried to see if prospective teachers who completed it would be better prepared to teach expanded communication contents such as: dialects, non-print media, advertising and career education.

By 1970, the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) had gathered enough information from its regional hearings to empanel a review committee of teachers, professors, educational administrators and PDE personnel who were charged to suggest any final changes for a set of proposed standards for the Communication program. After minor changes, the panel unanimously endorsed the following recommendations which are the current standards for the fulfillment of the Communication credential:

STANDARD I

Demonstration of:

A. Understanding of the nature and functions of the communication process.
B. Understanding of the processes of language learning and the development of language and communication skills.
C. Understanding of the historical development and present characteristics of the English language.
D. Understanding and appreciation of representative and appropriate works from a variety of literature.
E. Ability to listen, observe, and speak effectively, in informal and formal situations.
F. Ability to read critically and write effectively for varying purposes.
G. An ability to assist students in integrating their communication skills and concepts with varieties of experiences.

STANDARD II

Concentrated study in one or more of the following areas: linguistic science; speech; literature; writing; journalism; theatre, and non-print media.

By 1975, thirty-three Commonwealth colleges and universities had PDE-approved Communication programs, that is, programs which met the above-listed standards. The PDE-approval was granted after the Department reviewed recommendations for such approval by on-site program evaluation teams consisting of teachers, administrators and college professors. These teams carefully reviewed each college's criteria for the fulfillment of each Communication standard, interviewed faculty members and students involved with the program, visited classrooms, laboratories and public schools where program participants were working and recommended no approval, short range approval or long range approval--the latter a five-year limitation. In the case of a short range approval, the team could recommend another on-site evaluation within one or two years with the option of then granting a five-year approval provided that recommendations for strengthening the program (the basis for the short range approval) had been carried out.

An arbitrary estimate of the number of Communication-credentialed teachers within the Commonwealth in June, 1975 (the beginning date for this study) would place that number somewhere between 150 and 200. These limited numbers are a function of the late start for the Program (most institutions received PDE-approval after 1972) and the diminishing enrollments in all teacher education programs but, particularly, in English and related areas. Granting the small potential sample, it still seemed worthwhile to examine administrators' and teachers' attitudes about the Communication credential as compared to their attitudes about the Comprehensive English credential.

Purposes

There were two purposes for this study: first, to examine school administrators' uses, if any, of the Communication credential in teacher employment and, secondly, to examine the attitudes and employment experiences of Communication-credentialed teachers to discover what differences, if any, their new credential had on their teaching assignments.

Limitations

Information reported about the above-listed purposes should be cautiously interpreted due to the following limitations of this study:

(1) Sample size--while the number of administrators (N=52) seemed sufficient for statistical treatment, the fact that few administrators from urban schools were included in the sample meant that administrators who most strongly endorsed the alternative credential were not represented. Similarly, the newness of the Program limited the number of Communication-credentialed teachers who could be sampled.

(2) Treatment of data--the small numbers involved in both samples (administrators/teachers) precluded use of the important "significance-of-difference" data treatments; consequently, only percentages could be used to report findings, and those percentages should be cautiously reviewed within the limited contexts from which they were derived.

Procedures

Using PDE-Communication Standards I and II as a base, two anonymous questionnaires (one for administrators, [17 items] the other for Communication-certified teacher [21 items]) were drafted, pretested and distributed to the target groups for this study. "Standards" as displayed in both questionnaires had variations which occurred only in the question-items. Item 8, for example, in the administrators' and teachers' questionnaires were as follows:

(Administrator) As compared to English teachers, Communication teachers understand the communication process

(a) better (b) as well as (c) not so well as English teachers.

(Teacher) As a communication teacher, do you feel that you understand the communication process

(a) better (b) as well as (c) not so well as English teachers?

"Understanding the communication process" is the Standard to be evaluated by both groups, and each of the Standards (including Standard II) had formats similar to Item 8, above.

Two groups of teachers enrolled in summer courses at The Pennsylvania State University (1975) were used to pretest the teachers' questionnaires. They described the directions for the completion of the questionnaire as "clear," the items unambiguous, and the instrument ready for mailing. Format similarities between the teachers' and administrators' questionnaires prompted the arbitrary judgment that pretesting administrators' questionnaires would be unnecessary.

In August 1975, letters were sent to the Directors of Teacher Placement at each of the 33 colleges identified by PDE as having an approved teacher training program for Communication. These letters briefly described the study and asked for Directors' cooperation in identifying and forwarding to five of their Communication-credentialed graduates, the questionnaire and materials for its return. The Directors were also asked to forward the questionnaire and the return of materials to appropriate sources (Head of English and/or Communication department) if they themselves were unable to identify recent graduates with Communication certificates.

Administrators' questionnaires were distributed by hand at the July, 1975, Pennsylvania School Administrators' Conference held at The Pennsylvania State University. After a brief explanation of the purposes of the study, 52 administrators completed the questionnaire. Although there were 119 administrators in attandence, only those who had secondary school responsibilities completed the questionnaire. Of those administrators who had secondary responsibilities one questionnaire item further reduced the size of the sample by specifying that if the administrator "had not employed teachers certified in Communication," he/she was to turn in the Answer Sheet. This specification reduced the number of administrators who completed all items on the questionnaire to eight.

IBM Answer Sheets, machine-scored, were used to display all respondents' (administrators/teachers) percentages, item analyses, mean scores and standard deviations for each questionnaire item. Besides the questions on each of the Communication Standards, there were five "test" items used to check teacher-respondents' content in the general areas of communication, history of the English language, literature, and composition. These test items plus data about school size, location, public or private classification comprised the additional information sought via the questionnaire.

Findings

Of the 52 administrators who responded to the questionnaire, 18 were superintendents, 23 were principals and 11 "other," probably curriculum supervisors or coordinators but not department heads (because that classification was not checked by these administrators). Ten of these administrators classified themselves as coming from urban districts, 17 from suburban and 23 from rural districts with the balance coming from "other." In other words, about 42 percent of the administrators came from districts which, by definition, had urged the adoption of the Communication credential over the Comprehensive English credential. Finally, 48 of the 52 administrators were from public schools and 34 of the 48

worked in districts with enrollments between 1201 and 1500 pupils, again, implying that these administrators were within the group which supported the Communication credential.

Administrators asked if they had employed Communication teachers replied 40, "no"; 8, "yes"; the other 4 of the 52 did not answer this question. To be fair to the administrators, one has to recognize that there were only 150-200 Communication-certified teachers throughout the Commonwealth in 1975, so the probability of a random administrator employing a Communication teacher would be very small. But among those administrators who had hired Communication teachers only 3 said that they had used Standard II of the credential in making teacher assignments. With respect to the other Standards, administrators' responses were so small and/or so evenly divided (4-3, 4-4) that it would be a distortion of fact to draw inferences about the significance of their choices. The one exception to this generalization (and one verified by the Communication teachers' responses) was to Item 11 where administrators felt that Communication teachers "were not so well trained" as English teachers to "understand appropriate works from a variety of literatures." Six of the eight administrators checked that negative judgment.

The 31 teachers who responded to the questionnaire represented perhaps 10 of the 33 colleges authorized to grant the Communication credential. Ten is an inference drawn from postmarks and from statements by colleges (Lafayette College, for example) which noted that while they are authorized to certify people in Communication, "however to date we do not have any graduates in this field."

Of the 31 teacher respondents, 23 were female; 8, male; 5 worked in "urban" schools, 12 in "suburban," 12 in "rural," and 2 in "other"; 26 of them worked in "public" schools, 2 in "parochial," and 3 in "other"; 25 of them worked in junior-senior high schools with populations between 901-1500 for Grades 7-12; one worked in a school with a population of less than 600 students and 5 worked in schools with populations of 601-900 in Grades 7-12.

Of the 29 teachers who responded to the question as to whether or not they were asked at the time of their interview about the differences between Communication and Comprehensive English certification, 17 (58.6 percent) said that they were asked and 12 (41.4 percent) said that they were not. Asked how heavily their work in Standard II of the Communication credential was used in their assignment of teaching duties, 11 (35.5 percent) checked "heavily," 15 (41.4 percent) checked "some," and 3 (9.7 percent) checked "not at all."

Communication teachers' responses to items pertinent to Standard I were as expected with two exceptions, the exceptions being their judgments about their "understanding of the historical development of the English language" and their "understanding of appropriate works from a variety of literatures." The "expected" responses for the other items were that they felt they were educated "better" or "as well as" English teachers in "language learning and communication skills, the communication process" and all other Standard I criteria. Even in the two previously noted exception areas, only 9 (29.0 percent) and 8 (25.8 percent) of the sampled teachers, respectively, felt that they were "not so well" educated as English teachers in those areas. Their judgments are somewhat supported by sampled teachers' responses to questionnaire "test" items 17 and 18 which dealt with syntax identification and Grimm's law. Responses to syntax identification showed 17 (55 percent) of the sample missing that: similarly 14 (45 percent) missed the Grimm's law question. But only 10 (33 percent) of the sample missed the "test" literature question. The other two "test" questions on communication and expository writing were correctly answered by over 60 percent of the sampled teachers.

The last item on the teacher questionnaire asked respondents to identify the concentration area (linguistics, speech, etc.) used to fulfill Standard II of the Communication requirement. Standard II specifies "one or more" concentration areas, but most teachers in the sample identified only one area. Apparently, however,

one or more colleges in the Pittsburgh area (postmark identification) are requiring their Communication students to use two or more areas for their concentration because six of the 29 teacher respondents from that area identified two or more concentration areas. The actual listing for concentrations was as follows: linguistic science (2), speech (13), literature (13), writing (2), journalism (3), theatre (2), non-print (1).

Discussion

It is important to keep in mind the limitations of this survey (sample sizes, no statistical treatment of data) in the material which follows. Concerning the administrators, it's worth noting that only 8 of the 52 sampled had worked with Communication-certified teachers. While it's true that the number of such teachers is small another facet of these data was that about 25 percent of the administrators were unaware of the fact that there was a Communication credential. Since, historically, administrators were the catalysts in PDE's development of the credential, and since a good number of the sampled administrators came from large school districts where such a credential was proposed as a better alternative to the Comprehensive English Certificate, it's hard to explain why school administrators are not more informed about the credential.

Concerning the teachers, it's worth noting that they identify their certification program as being "better" than or equal to that provided for Comprehensive English teachers. They also feel that their students consider them "better than" or "equal to" English teachers in the performance of their teaching duties. Their judgments about these comparisons hold up pretty well when "test" items are used for verification except in the history of language and syntax areas. The test items themselves were somewhat arbitrary and might be faulted for nit-picking, that is, they are low level (Bloom taxonomic reference) recall/ recognition items; they seemed to the researcher, however, to deal with contents

fundamental to the Standard I Communication category for which they were designed. Assumed with those test items was that anyone who studies Communication as a discipline would know the Shannon-Weaver model for same; that anyone who studied the history of the English language would recognize the contents of Grimm's law; these, however, may be sweeping assumptions which need to be tested more systematically.

Concerning Standard II of the Communication credential, it is somewhat surprising to find so many Communication teachers selecting the literature concentration when, as previously noted, it was exactly the overspecialization in that concentration which moved administrators to propose the Communication credential. Also surprising were the small numbers of teachers identifying theatre and non-print concentrations since these two areas are important segments of new textbooks for teaching not only communication but also English. Writing is also low as an area of concentration and, given the current public opinion about the necessity for improvement in writing, perhaps colleges which offer the Communication credential should alert prospective Communication teachers to that "basic" as a possible area for the enhancement of their job prospects.

Conclusions

From the foregoing information (keeping in mind the limitations of the study) one might draw the following conclusions:

1. The Communication credential--its purposes, standards, and uses--needs to be more widely advertised among Commonwealth administrators if it is ever to challenge the Comprehensive English credential.
2. Teachers certified in Communication seem to feel that they hold equal status with teachers certified in Comprehensive English. A comparative study of the two groups needs to be made using a larger sample, statistical treatment of data and funding to support the costs of the development of a valid and reliable instrument to make such a comparison.

3. Clusters of evaluation techniques (observations, academic content, student judgments) need to factored into any valid judgment about the worth of either or both certification credentials.
4. Content and performance criteria used in methods courses required for both credentials need to be examined to see whether or not there are significant content differences in those courses as well as in other certification courses such that one could justify separate credentialing for Communication and Comprehensive English teachers.

The ultimate test of any credential is whether it delivers what it promises. Up to this point the issue of the values of the two credentials remains in doubt. But with the growing numbers of Communication teachers a good start on the answer to the credential question should be available provided that the Pennsylvania Department of Education or other suitable agency can find the necessary funds for such a study.

Appendix A

Administrators' Questionnaire

Administrator Respondent
N=52

On the top of your Answer Sheet, please identify your school or district.

1. Position of person completing this questionnaire
   (a) Superintendent 18 (b) Principal 23 (c) Dept. Head 0 (d) Other 11

2. Classification of District
   (a) Urban 10 (b) Suburban 17 (c) Rural 23 (d) Other 2

3. Type of School(s)
   (a) Public 48 (b) Parochial 1 (c) Private 1 (d) Other 2

4. Approximate number of students enrolled in Grades 7-12.
   (a) 0-600 3 (b) 601-900 6 (c) 901-1200 5 (d) 1201-1500 34 (d) above 1500 2
   No response 2

Part I

5. Have you employed teachers certified in Communication?
   (a) yes 8 (b) no 40 No response 2
   If your answer to Item 5 was "no," disregard the rest of the items and turn in your Answer Sheet.
   If your answer to Item 5 was "yes," please complete the rest of the questionnaire.

N=8

6. Do you consider the Communication teacher you hired to be
   (a) more able 1 (b) equally able 7 (c) less able 0 than English teachers in their teaching of English?

7. Has your school (district) used Communication teachers' Standard II concentration in assigning teaching responsibilities to Communication teachers?
   (a) yes 2 (b) no 6

8. As compared to English teachers, Communication teachers understand the communication process
   (a) better 3 (b) as well as 5 (c) not so well as 0 English teachers

9. As compared to English teachers, Communication teachers understand language learning and communication skills
   (a) better 2 (b) as well as 6 (c) not so well as 0 English teachers

10. As compared to English teachers, Communication teachers understand the historical development and present characteristics of the English language
    (a) better 1 (b) as well as 6 (c) not so well as 1 English teachers

11. As compared to English teachers, Communication teachers understand appropriate works from a variety of literature
    (a) better 0 (b) as well as 5 (c) not so well as 0 English teachers

12. As compared to English teachers, Communication teachers have the ability to listen and speak in informal and formal situations
    (a) better 3 (b) as well as 5 (c) not so well as 0 English teachers

13. As compared to English teachers, Communication teachers have the ability to read critically and write effectively
    (a) better 0 (b) as well as 6 (c) not so well as 1 English teachers No response 1

14. As compared to English teachers, Communication teachers have the ability to assist students to intergrate communication skills
    (a) better 4 (b) as well as 3 (c) not so well as 1 English teachers

15. High school students' attitudes toward Communication teachers as contrasted with English teachers tend, on the whole, to be
    (a) more favorable 2 (b) the same as 5 (c) less favorable 1

16. As compared to English teachers, Communication teachers' teaching techniques in a given class period tend to be
(a) more varied 3 (b) the same as 3 (c) less varied 1 than those used by English teachers No response 1

17. Students' acquisition of writing skills as taught by teachers of Communication as compared to teachers of English tend to be
(a) better 1 (b) the same as 5 (c) less than 1 skills acquired in English classes No response 1

Appendix B

Communication Teachers' Questionnaire

Teacher Respondent
N=31

Personal Data

1. Your Sex
   (A) Female 23 (B) Male 8

2. Classification of your school district
   (A) Urban 5 (B) Suburban 12 (C) Rural 12 (D) Other 1 No response 1

3. Type of school
   (A) Public 26 (B) Parochial 2 (C) Private 1 (D) Other 0 No response 2

4. Approximate number of students enrolled in Grades 7-12
   (A) 0-600 1 (B) 601-900 3 (C) 901-1200 7 (D) 1201-1500 10 (E) above 1500 0
   No response 2

Professional Data

5. At your interview for your present position, were you asked about the differences between a teacher certified in Communication and one certified in Comprehensive English?
   (A) Yes 12 (B) No 17 No response 2

6. Do you consider yourself to be (as compared to Comprehensive English teachers)
   (A) more able 9 (B) equally able 16 (C) less able 5 to fulfill your teaching duties? No response 1

7. To what extent was your area of concentration (Standard II) used in the assignment of your teaching responsibilities?
   (A) heavily 11 (B) some 15 (C) not at all 3 No response 2

8. As a communication teacher, do you feel that you understand the communication process
   (A) better (B) as well as 6 (C) not so well as 0 English teachers?

9. As a communication teacher, do you understand language learning and communication skills
   (A) better 18 (B) as well as 12 (C) not so well as 0 English teachers?
   No response 1

10. As a communication teacher, do you understand the historical development and present characteristics of the English language
    (A) better 8 (B) as well as 14 (C) not so well as 9 English teachers?

11. As a communication teacher, do you understand appropriate works from a variety of literatures
    (A) better 5 (B) as well as 17 (C) not so well as 8 English teachers?
    No response 1

12. As a communication teacher, do you feel that you have the ability to listen and speak in informal and formal situations
    (A) better 21 (B) as well as 10 (C) not so well as 0 English teachers?

13. As a communication teacher, do you feel that you have the ability to read critically and write effectively
    (A) better 8 (B) as well as 21 (C) not so well as 2 English teachers?

14. As a communication teacher, do you feel that you have the ability to assist students to intergrate communication skills
    (A) better 26 (B) as well as 4 (C) not so well as 1 English teachers?

15. From your observations, high school students' attitudes toward Communication teachers as contrasted with English teachers tend, on the whole, to be
    (A) more favorable 15 (B) the same as 15 (C) less favorable 0 No response 1

16. The Shannon-Weaver model is used as one basis for teaching
(A) writing 9 (B) mathematics 1 (C) chemistry 1 (D)* communication 18
No response 2

17. Articulation of sounds into meaningful segments and the representation of those segments in writing is one definition of
(A) morphemes 17 (B)* syntax 11 (C) suprasegmentals 3 (D) improvisation 0

18. Grimm's law deals with
(A) literary criticism 1 (B) vowel shifts 7 (C) transformations 7
(D)* consonant shifts 13 No response 4

19. Transitional literature is a term used synonymously with
(A)* adolescent literature 20 (B) classical literature 8 (C) epic literature 2
(D) graffiti 0 No response 1

20. Unity, coherence and emphasis are usually associated with
(A) creative writing 2 (B) journal jotting 0 (C)* expository writing 29
(D) happenings 0

21. Which of the Standard II emphases did you use to fulfill your Communication certification requirement?
(A) linguistic science 2 (B) speech 13 (C) literature 13 (D) writing 2
(E) journalism 3 (F) theatre 2 (G) non-print media 1 (H) Other 0

---

*Indicates correct response

Appendix C

Letter to Placement Directors

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
CHAMBERS BUILDING
UNIVERSITY PARK, PENNSYLVANIA 16802

College of Education
Division of Academic
Curriculum and Instruction

August 10, 1976

Dear Teacher-Placement Director:

Please excuse the impersonality of this form letter, but I am directing this letter to thirty-three colleges and universities who certify Communication teachers and trying to economize through this generalized format.

Materials enclosed with this letter may be misdirected to you, that is, the chairpersons or heads of English and/or Communication departments might be a more appropriate source, but you alone would know best where the enclosures should be directed.

Target of the enclosed materials are five recent graduates of your institution who have completed certification requirements for the Communication teaching credential. According to Pennsylvania Department of Education officials, the Communication credential has been operational since 1972, and the enclosed materials are an attempt to make a preliminary assessment of the credential's impact in the Commonwealth's secondary schools.

No institution will be identified in this study, nor will any questionnaire respondent be identified. Anonoymity will be preserved.

A group of superintendents and high school principals have already completed the questionnaire and their responses will be compared to the responses made by recent graduates of Commonwealth colleges and universities who have been certified as Communication teachers.

Given the foregoing information, will you please:

1. Address the five business envelopes enclosed to five of your recent graduates who have been certified as Communication teachers? (Any five, male or female, best or worst will do.)

2. If you can not do that, will you please forward the materials along with this covering letter and ask the Chairperson or Head of your English/Communication department to address the five envelopes?

Your patience and cooperation with my requests are deeply appreciated.

Very truly yours,

Edward R. Fagan

Edward R. Fagan
Professor of Language Education

ERF/cdr

P.S. Copies of the completed study should be available after January 1, 1977 and may be requested by writing to me at the above-listed address.

Appendix D

Colleges Authorized by PDE to
Offer the Communication Credential
as of June, 1975

COMMUNICATION

Allegheny College

Bloomsburg State College

Bucknell College

Carlow College

Carnegie-Mellon University

Clarion State College

Duquesne University

East Stroudsburg State College

Eastern College

Elizabethtown College

Franklin & Marshall College

Grove City College

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Kutztown State College

Lafayette College

Lock Haven State College

Mansfield State College

The Pennsylvania State University

Shippensburg State College

Slippery Rock State College

Temple University

University of Scranton

Villanova University

Westminster College

York College

Allentown College of St. Francis de Sales

West Chester State College

California State College

University of Pittsburgh

Point Park College

University of Pittsburgh - Johnstown Campus

Millersville State College

Edinboro State College